

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,385,388 to Lewis et al. in view of U.S. Patent 7,305,624 to Siegel.

The Lewis et al. patent discloses a digital video apparatus user interface, in which a disc player, in which a video disc has been inserted, is instructed to play the content on the video disc, the disc player examiner whether a parental control has been encoded in the video manager of the video disc, and if so, only allows appropriate playback of the disc when the user selected parental control rating equals or exceeds the parental rating encoded in the video manager.

However, as noted by the Examiner, "Lewis does not teach associating a list of server addresses with said parental control levels and restricting the user access to the server addresses in said list having parental control level lower than or equal to said current parental control level."

The Siegel patent discloses a method for limiting Internet access, in which a computer owner or administrator is enabled to specify a "Navigational Boundary" with respect to a particular domain, and to subsequently allow browser navigation only within that boundary (see Abstract).

The Examiner now states "Siegel teaches using parental controls to limit access to questionable or objectionable web sites and content (column 38, lines 23-57)."

Applicants submit that the Examiner is mistaken. In particular, the noted section of Siegel states:

"Parental Controls

"There are currently a number of techniques utilized for the purpose of limiting Internet access which, among other things, help provide a safe Internet experience for kids with respect to the World Wide Web. These techniques are typically referred to as "blocking" or "filtering." Some implementations include: restricting access to only approved sites (often referred to as "white lists"); allowing access to all but a set of excluded sites (often referred to as "black lists"); employing techniques that block web pages or sites based on content, such as words.

"All these techniques have their drawbacks. The site exclusion technique has the drawback that inappropriate material may be viewed, quite simply because inappropriate sites are continuously being deployed, and all inappropriate sites are not on the exclusion list. The "approved sites approach" has the drawback that there is an exhaustive amount of material on the Web which is of interest or use to a child, but not contained within sites on the approved list. Filtering based on content, such as words, for example, has the drawback that it can block appropriate content, and miss inappropriate content.

"Additionally, the "word filtering", and the "approved sites" approach have the drawback that an unnatural environment is created, where a user may be surfing, then suddenly, be denied access to a particular site and/or page, with seemingly no rhyme or reason. For example, when using an Internet Service Provider that provides parental controls via a filtering mechanism, or using a filtering program in conjunction with a web browser, one can be surprised by a "Web Page Blocked" or similar notice, be redirected to a particular web page, or experience some other frustrating behavior.

"Yahoogigans! Is a well known and respected kids portal/search engine. Tables 10 and II present information regarding site selection with respect to Yahoogigans:...".

Applicants submit that a careful reading of the above section will show that Siegel is merely describing prior art methods to his purportedly inventive method, these prior art

methods being a "site exclusion" technique, an "approved sites approach" list, and filtering based on content (e.g., words). In particular, the site exclusion technique merely lists sites to which access is blocked; and the approved sites approach merely lists sites to which access is allowed.

The subject invention, as claimed in claim 1, includes "associating a list of server addresses with said parental control levels" and "restricting the user access to the server addresses in said list having parental control level lower than or equal to said current parental control level". The associating step is described in the specification on page 5, line 12 to page 6, line 12, and includes generating lists of server addresses associated with each parental control level in the set of parental control levels of the information carrier player. Then in the restricting step, access is only allowed to server addresses in the list(s) having parental control levels lower than or equal to the current parental control level set for the information carrier player.

Applicants therefore submit that the combination of Lewis et al. and Siegel does not disclose or suggest "associating a list of server addresses with said parental control levels" and "restricting the user access to the server addresses in said list having parental control level lower than or equal to said current parental control level".

In view of the above, Applicants believe that the subject invention, as claimed, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the prior art, and as such, is patentable thereover.

Applicants believe that this application, containing claims 1-3 and 5, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by /Edward W. Goodman/
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613
Attorney
Tel.: 914-333-9611